

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1-3 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimori (US 2003/0016260).

5

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to overcome these rejections.

Claim 1 recites that a plurality of test driving signals are used for driving a printhead to print a plurality of test patterns on a printing medium. The test driving signals are generated according to test data, and the test data corresponds to at least one ideal straight line. Then the test pattern with optimal print quality is selected from the plurality of test patterns for determining the optimal driving signal that corresponds to the test pattern with the optimal print quality. When selecting the test pattern with the optimal print quality, differences in quality between the printed test patterns and the ideal straight line are considered. Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in Figure 5 and paragraphs [0030] and [0031] of the specification of the instant application, and no new matter is added through these amendments.

10

15

On the other hand, Fujimori does not teach that the test pattern with the optimal print quality is selected according to differences in quality between the printed test patterns and the ideal straight line. Otsuki et al. (US 2004/0080555) teaches in Figure 16 and in paragraphs [0105]-[0108] printing vertical lines on a medium during forward and reverse passes of the printhead over the medium. The user then selects the test pattern in which the vertical line printed in the forward pass best aligns with the vertical line printed in the reverse pass.

20

25

However, neither Fujimori nor Otsuki teaches selecting line test patterns that

have the least difference in quality when compared to an ideal straight line.
Therefore, the cited prior art does not teach all of the claimed limitations taught in claim 1, and claim 1 should be allowable over the combination of Fujimori and Otsuki.

5

Claim 18 has been amended in a way similar to the amendment of claim 1. Claim 18 recites that a plurality of driving signals are used for driving a printhead to print a plurality of test patterns on a printing medium. The test patterns comprise a plurality of first color straight lines. Then the test pattern with optimal print quality is selected from the plurality of test patterns for determining the optimal driving signal that corresponds to the test pattern with the optimal print quality. When selecting the test pattern with the optimal print quality, the test pattern having a smallest difference in quality between the first color straight lines and ideal straight lines are selected to be the test pattern with optimal print quality.

10

15

Support for the amendments to claim 18 is found in Figures 5 and 10 and paragraphs [0030], [0031], [0038], and [0039] of the specification of the instant application, and no new matter is added through these amendments.

20

As noted above, neither Fujimori nor Otsuki teaches selecting line test patterns that have the least difference in quality when compared to ideal straight lines. Therefore, the cited prior art does not teach all of the claimed limitations taught in claim 18, and claim 18 should be allowable over the combination of Fujimori and Otsuki.

25

Claim 2 is cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Claims 3 and 19 are dependent on claims 1 and 18, respectively, and should be allowable if claims 1 and 18 are allowable. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 18, and 19 is respectfully

requested.

2. Rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
5 Fujimori (US 2003/0016260) in view of Otsuki et al. (US 2004/0080555).

Response:

Claim 7 is cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Claim 8 is
dependent on claim 1, and should be allowable if claim 1 is allowable.
10 Reconsideration of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Fujimori (US 2003/0016260) in view of Underwood et al. (US 7,054,034).
15

Response:

Claim 20 is cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

4. Rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
20 Fujimori (US 2003/0016260) in view of Underwood et al. (US 7,054,034), and
further in view of Otsuki et al. (US 2004/0080555).

Response:

25 Claim 21 is cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 18 and the above arguments in favor
of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance

Appl. No. 10/710,667
Amdt. dated November 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 13, 2006

be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: 11/21/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)